

Independent claim 3 defines a diffuser panel for diffusing light in a rear projection screen. The diffuser panel includes, *inter alia*, first reflecting elements for condensing light to substantially one spot or line, periodically provided in at least one direction between a light incident surface and a light existing surface, wherein the first reflecting elements are a plurality of types of reflection regions having different directivities of diffusion provided periodically.

Yata discloses a rear projection screen that has a plane of incidence which includes a plurality of prisms extending in lines or arcs. Each prism has a total reflection surface which totally reflects incident light so that the light emerges toward an observer and a surface opposite to the total reflection surface so that the totally reflected light is converged and then diffused. However, Yata fails to disclose a plurality reflecting elements of different types having different directivities of diffusion that condense light to substantially one spot or one line as claimed.

In rejecting claim 3, the Examiner asserts that element 1 of Fig. 6 of Yata discloses the first reflecting elements as claimed. To support this assertion the Examiner points to element 1C of Fig. 6 as disclosing that the prism 1A and 1B condenses light to substantially one spot or one line. This assertion is unfounded for the following reasons.

First, although Fig. 6 of Yata may illustrate convergence to a single point (i.e., 1C), as clearly shown in Fig. 7 and 8, and discussed at column 3, lines 31-52, the point of convergence depends on the angle of incidence of the light incident upon the prism. As a result, the light reflected from the prism of Yata may be converged to multiple points, depending on the angle of incidence. Accordingly, Yata fails to disclose reflecting elements that condense light to substantially one spot or one line as claimed.

Furthermore, nowhere in Yata is there any disclosure of the prisms having different directivities of diffusion as claimed. To the contrary, Yata discloses only that there are a

plurality of prisms extending along lines or concentric circular arcs in parallel, each prism having a total reflection surface.

Therefore, Yata fails to anticipate independent claim 3 because Yata fails to disclose each and every claimed element. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §102.

The application is in condition for allowance. Notice of same is earnestly solicited. Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Penny Caudle (Reg. No. 46,607) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Due: March 15, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

D. Richard Anderson

Registration No.: 40,439

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant